

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Ernest Eugens Pickett, # 256410,)	C/A No.: 4:13-496-RMG-TER
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	
)	Report and Recommendation
Mr. Marvin Brown; Mr. Scottie Thompson;)	
Hon. Ms. E. Joiner; Mr. Gary C. Lemel,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

Plaintiff, Ernest Eugens Pickett, proceeding *pro se*, files this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.¹ Plaintiff is a state prisoner confined at the Manning Correctional Institution, and files this action *in forma pauperis* under 28 U.S.C. § 1915. Pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B), and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d), D.S.C., the undersigned is authorized to review such complaints for relief and submit findings and recommendations to the district judge.

Plaintiff challenges his conviction and sentence for drug offenses. Plaintiff claims the York County, South Carolina multi-jurisdictional drug enforcement unit (“Unit”) conspired to entrap him. According to the Complaint, the Unit convinced Plaintiff’s cousin to purchase 500 grams of crack from the Plaintiff. When Plaintiff went to his cousin’s house, he was met by the police and arrested. In his Complaint, Plaintiff describes at some length the events surrounding his arrest. Plaintiff

¹

Plaintiff, who appears to be filing this matter pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, seeks release from incarceration, however, this relief may only be obtained in a habeas action. *See Preiser v. Rodriguez*, 411 U.S. 475, 500 (1973)(complaint or petition challenging the fact or duration of confinement should be construed and processed as a habeas corpus petition, while a complaint or petition challenging the conditions of confinement should be construed and processed as a complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983). The undersigned is treating this pleading as one filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. If the plaintiff wishes to challenge the duration of his confinement, he must obtain habeas forms from the Clerk of Court and file a separate action, after he has fully exhausted his administrative remedies.

complains he did not have knowledge of one of the warrants taken out against him prior to giving his plea. He claims he told his public defender “a number of times” that he wanted to go to trial, but he claims his public defender, the solicitor’s office, and members of the drug unit coerced and tricked him into pleading guilty. Plaintiff states that he was not the target of the investigation, but rather, his supplier was, and that Defendant Brown “knew that [he] had no drug, and that [he] cooperate[d] fully with law enforcement, [and therefore he] ... fully expected and was promised to be set free.” He states that “the acts and [o]missions described herein violated [his] rights under [the] U.S. Constitution and laws of the [U]nited States, along with the South Carolina Constitution and laws.” He asks the Court to “[g]rant just relief and equitable relief that this Honorable Court deems necessary. And Grant [him] Summary Judgement.”

Under established local procedure in this judicial district, a careful review has been made of the pro se complaint pursuant to the procedural provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915; 28 U.S.C. § 1915A; and the Prison Litigation Reform Act, Pub. L. No. 104-134, 110 Stat. 1321 (1996). This review has been conducted in light of the following precedents: *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 112 S.Ct. 1728 (1992); *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 109 S.Ct. 1827 (1989); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 92 S.Ct. 594 (1972); *Nasim v. Warden, Maryland House of Correction*, 64 F.3d 951 (4th Cir. 1995)(en banc); and *Todd v. Baskerville*, 712 F.2d 70 (4th Cir. 1983).

The complaint herein has been filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915, which permits an indigent litigant to commence an action in federal court without prepaying the administrative costs of proceeding with the lawsuit. To protect against possible abuses of this privilege, the statute allows a district court to dismiss the case upon a finding that the action “fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted” or is “frivolous or malicious.” 28 U.S.C. §1915(e)(2)(B)(i), (ii). A finding of frivolity can be made where the complaint “lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact.”

Denton v. Hernandez, 504 U.S. at 31. Hence, under 28 U.S.C. §1915(e)(2)(B), a claim based on a meritless legal theory may be dismissed *sua sponte*. *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319 (1989).

This court is required to liberally construe pro se documents, *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 97 S. Ct. 285 (1976), holding them to a less stringent standard than those drafted by attorneys, *Hughes v. Rowe*, 449 U.S. 5, 101 S. Ct. 173 (1980)(per curiam). Even under this less stringent standard, however, the pro se petition is subject to summary dismissal. The mandated liberal construction afforded pro se pleadings means that if the court can reasonably read the pleadings to state a valid claim on which the plaintiff could prevail, it should do so, but a district court may not rewrite a petition to “conjure up questions never squarely presented” to the court. *Beaudett v. City of Hampton*, 775 F.2d 1274, 1278 (4th Cir. 1985). The requirement of liberal construction does not mean that the court can ignore a clear failure in the pleading to allege facts which set forth a claim currently cognizable in a federal district court. *Weller v. Department of Social Services*, 901 F.2d 387 (4th Cir. 1990). Plaintiff is attempting to challenge his guilty plea and sentence. He appears to allege that his public defender was involved in a conspiracy with the solicitor and the drug unit. To the extent he is alleging a defendant was involved in some “conspiracy,” the complaint clearly is inadequate to state a claim. *See Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662 (2009) (*quoting Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544 (2007)).

Insofar as the plaintiff's subsequent conviction, related state court proceedings, and arrest are concerned, the § 1983 complaint is subject to summary dismissal because a right of action has not yet accrued. *See Heck v. Humphrey*, 512 U.S. 477 (1994):

We hold that, in order to recover damages for allegedly unconstitutional conviction or imprisonment, or for other harm whose unlawfulness would render a conviction or sentence invalid, . . . a § 1983 plaintiff must prove that the conviction or sentence has been reversed on direct appeal, expunged by executive order, declared invalid by a state tribunal authorized to make such a determination, or called into question by a federal court's issuance of a writ of habeas corpus, 28 U.S.C. § 2254. A claim

for damages bearing that relationship to a conviction or sentence that has not been so invalidated is not cognizable under § 1983. Thus, when a state prisoner seeks damages in a § 1983 suit, the district court must consider whether a judgment in favor of the plaintiff would necessarily imply the invalidity of his conviction or sentence; if it would, the complaint must be dismissed unless the plaintiff can demonstrate that the conviction or sentence has already been invalidated.

Heck v. Humphrey, *supra*. See also *Schafer v. Moore*, 46 F.3d 43 (8th Cir. 1995)("Therefore, in light of *Heck*, the complaint was properly dismissed for failure to state a claim."); and *Woods v. Candela*, 47 F.3d 545 (2nd Cir. 1995)(*per curium*)(plaintiff's conviction reversed by state court in 1993; hence, civil rights action timely filed). See also *Brooks v. City of Winston-Salem, N.C.*, 85 F.3d 178 (4th Cir. 1996). *Accord Smith v. Holtz*, 879 F. Supp. 435 (M.D.Pa., March 24, 1995); *Burnside v. Mathis*, 2004 WL 2944092 (D.S.C. 2004).

Since the plaintiff has failed to establish that his conviction has been reversed, expunged, or declared invalid by a state court, and no federal writ of habeas corpus has been issued, this action must be dismissed for failure to state a claim.

RECOMMENDATION

Accordingly, it is recommended that the District Court dismiss the complaint in the above-captioned case *without prejudice* and without issuance and service of process. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915A [the court shall review, as soon as practicable after docketing, prisoner cases to determine whether they are subject to any grounds for dismissal].

s/Thomas E. Rogers, III
Thomas E. Rogers, III
United States Magistrate Judge

March 26, 2013
Florence, South Carolina

The plaintiff's attention is directed to the important notice on the next page.

Notice of Right to File Objections to Report and Recommendation

The parties are advised that they may file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation with the District Judge. Objections must specifically identify the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections are made and the basis for such objections. “[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Specific written objections must be filed within fourteen (14) days of the date of service of this Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a), (d). Filing by mail pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5 may be accomplished by mailing objections to:

Larry W. Propes, Clerk
United States District Court
Post Office Box 2317
Florence, South Carolina 29503

Failure to timely file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation will result in waiver of the right to appeal from a judgment of the District Court based upon such Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984).